



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,284	06/20/2003	Steve Burns	50277-2139	9791

42425 7590 12/28/2006  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER
----------

TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/28/2006	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/600,284	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BURNS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Wilson Tsui	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on: 6/20/2003.
2. Claims 1 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 1-46 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999).

With regards to claim 1, Abrams et al teaches:

- *Establishing a page parameter for the page* (column 4, lines 13-30: whereas, multiple page parameters are established for the page, including URL parameters, and constraint parameters)
- *Mapping the page parameter to a portlet parameter associated with a component of the page* (column 4, lines 13-30: whereas, the multiple page parameters are mapped to corresponding portlets (240, 250, and 260) within a portal page);
- *... and in response to receiving a request to display the page, performing the*

*steps of inspecting a mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to the portlet parameter (As shown in Fig 2a, and Fig 2b, and explained in column 4, lines 13-30, the page parameters are checked and refined by a user to determine what summary information to display in the portlets (240, 250, and 260));*

- *Passing a value associated with the page parameter as a value of the portlet parameter to a routine responsible for rendering the component, and the routine generating the component based upon the value associated with the portlet parameter (Fig 2a, and Fig 2b: whereas, the portlets use page parameters such as URL data to display page/summary information for the page located at the particular URL, and constraint based parameters to display constraint based page/summary information for the page located at the particular URL).*

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the step of mapping the page parameter, further comprises the steps of: mapping the page parameter to a second portlet parameter associated with a second component of the page; and passing the value associated with the page parameter as the value of the second portlet parameter to a routine responsible for rendering the second component, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas multiple portlets receive one or more page parameters).*

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, *wherein: the step of establishing the page parameter for the page further comprises the step of establishing a plurality of page parameters for the page; the step of mapping the page parameter to the portlet*

Art Unit: 2178

*parameter further comprises the step of establishing a mapping of the plurality of page parameters to a plurality of portlet parameters associated with the component of the web page; the step of inspecting the mapping further comprises the step of inspecting the mapping to determine which the page parameters of the plurality of page parameters are mapped to each of the plurality of portlet parameters; the step of passing the value further comprises the step of passing, based on the mapping, values associated with the plurality of page parameters as the values of the plurality of portlet parameters to the routine responsible for rendering the component; and the step of the routine generating further comprises the step of the routine generating the component based upon the values associated with the plurality of portlet parameters, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.*

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the step of mapping further comprises the step of mapping a first page parameter to a first portlet parameter associated with the component of the page and mapping a second page parameter to a second portlet parameter associated with the component of the page*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is the first page parameter, and constraint based parameters are used as secondary parameters for the component of the page; and thus, rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the request to display the page includes a URL and the URL includes the value associated with the page parameter, and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the value contained in the URL as the value of*

Art Unit: 2178

*the portlet parameter* (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 13-30, and in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is used as parameter information, to be passed as the value of the portlet parameter).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the steps of: presenting to a user a user interface for customizing the page; in response to the user interacting with the user interface, obtaining a user specified value for the page parameter; and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the user specified value as the value of the portlet parameter to the routine responsible for rendering the component* (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying the component).

With regards to claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the step of presenting to a page designer a user interface for specifying the mapping between the page parameter and the portlet parameter* ((whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying/mapping the component)).

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches registering the routine with a portal repository, wherein the process of registering the routine causes data associated with the routine to be stored in the portal repository (Claim 1: whereas, a data source comprises registered profile data associated with the routine).

Art Unit: 2178

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the step of a page designer interacting with a user interface to create the mapping between the portlet parameter and the page parameter* (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying/mapping the component).

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *the method further comprises the step of retrieving the stored value; and the step of the routine generating the component further comprises the step of the routine generating the component based upon the retrieved value* (claim 1 of Abrams et al, Fig. 2A: whereas, the stored value(s)/preferences/constraints are stored in data stores, which are used to generate the components 240, 250, and 260).

With regards to claim 18. Abrams et al teaches a method comprising:

- *In response to a user manipulating a component associated with a page, causing logic associated with the page to generate a particular event* (column 4, lines 20-21: whereas a user manipulates a web address in component 220, causing the page to generate a URL selection event)
- *Passing data that represents the particular event to the logic associated with the page, the logic associated with the component inspecting mapping data that maps events to actions, determining, based on the mapping data, an action to perform in response to the particular event; and causing the action to be performed:* (column 4, lines 21-29: whereas, the URL data that represents the

event is mapped to panes 240, 250, and 260, and a display action with regards to the URL data is performed)

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the page is a first page and wherein the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of passing at least part of the data that represents the particular event to logic responsible for rendering a second page*, as similarly explained in claim 1, the URL data is passed to logic/routine(s) responsible for rendering an updated/second page, and is rejected under the similar rationale.

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of generating a request that specifies a URL, wherein at least part of the data about the particular event is included in the URL*: (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 13-30, and in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is used as parameter information, to be passed as the value of the portlet parameter).

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Abrams et al teaches: *the step of generating the request further comprises the step of generating a request for executable code; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of invoking the executable code*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, page parameter data is passed to the appropriate portlet parameters, and the passing of the value causes the display/render action to be performed. Since the rendering as shown in Fig 2A as performed/executed, the figure inherently teaches that code must have been executed in order for the appropriate components/portlets to have been updated

with the mapped parameter values.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the executable code is a web service* (column 1, lines 45-60: whereas, the executable code, provides user's with a service to collect information from disparate sources, to be displayed in a summarized and consistent manner).

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches wherein: *the step of passing the data that represents the particular event further comprises the step of passing a value of an event output parameter associated with the particular event; the step of inspecting mapping data further comprises the step of inspecting mapping data that maps the event output parameter to a target parameter that is passed as part of performing the action; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of passing the value of the event output parameter to the target parameter*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 18, since the URL selection event is generated, and a URL value is passed from the event output parameter, to cause the display action to have been performed, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 24, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 25, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the

Art Unit: 2178

one or more processors to perform the method recited in claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale

With regards to claim 26, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 28, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 30, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 31, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 8, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 36, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 13, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

With regards to claim 37, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 14, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 39, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the m the method recited in claim 16, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 40, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 17, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 41, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 18, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 42, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 19, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 43, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the

Art Unit: 2178

one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 20, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 44, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 21, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 45, for a teaches a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 22, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 46, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 23, and is rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed:

Nov. 4, 1999), in further view of Hind et al (US Application: 2004/0205555 A1, published: Oct. 14, 2004, filed: Sep. 18, 2001)

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *mapping the page parameter to the portlet parameter associated with the component of the page*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach ... *without mapping the page parameter to portlet parameters associated with any other components of the page*.

Hind et al teaches ... *without mapping the parameters to portlet parameters associated with any other components of the page* (Fig. 3A, paragraph 0024: whereas, content for some components/portlets are updated, while some are not, and thus components/portals are selectively mapped for receiving parameter data).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's method for mapping page parameters, to have only mapped page parameters to a select page component, as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for reach portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

With regards to claim 6, Abrams et al teaches *establishing the page parameter, and passing the value associated with the page parameter further comprises the step of passing the value as the value of the portlet parameter to the routine responsible for rendering the component*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is

rejected under similar rationale. However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach the value associated with the page parameter is a *default value*.

Hind et al teaches a *default value* (paragraph 0032: whereas, default textual parameter data is used when data is unavailable for a component/portlet).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's method for mapping a page parameter to a portlet parameter, such that the page parameter value is a default value, as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for reach portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

With regards to claim 27, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 29, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 9 – 12, and 32 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999, and Hind et al (US Application: 2004/0205555 A1, published: Oct. 14,

2004, filed: Sep. 18, 2001), in further view of Burnard et al (US Patent: 5,613,122, issued: Mar. 18, 1997, filed: Nov. 14, 1994).

With regards to claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *determining a selected value based on override preferences* (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined), and *passing the selected value as the value of the portlet parameter to the routine responsible for rendering the component* (as similarly explained in the claim 1, and also in column 6, lines 12-32, the selected preference values are used to render a customized view). However, although Abrams et al teaches, override preferences, Abrams et al does not expressly teach an override *hierarchy*.

Burnard et al teaches an override *hierarchy* (Abstract: whereas, objects at a particular level, override objects from a different hierarchical level).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's override preferences, such that the overriding process is based on an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination of Abrams et al and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) *and a customize page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection

Art Unit: 2178

for claim 1, whereas the constraint based parameters, are custom page parameter values), as well as *override* preferences (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach an *override hierarchy that specifies that the URL page is the page parameter value is the selected value.*

Abrams et al and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's plurality of values such that a specific page parameter value, such as a URL page parameter value is used as the default page parameter value as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for reach portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

However, the combination of Abrams et al and Hind et al do not expressly teach an *override hierarchy.*

Burnard et al teaches an *override hierarchy*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 9.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which includes the URL page as the default page parameter, to have further included an *override hierarchy*, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination would have allowed

Art Unit: 2178

Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) *and a customize page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas the constraint based parameters, are custom page parameter values), as well as *override preferences* (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach an *override hierarchy that specifies that the customize page parameter value is the page parameter value is the selected value.*

Abrams et al and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's plurality of values such that a specific page parameter value, such as a customize page parameter value is used as the default page parameter value as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for reach portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

However, the combination of Abrams et al and Hind et al do not expressly teach an *override hierarchy.*

Art Unit: 2178

Burnard et al teaches an *override hierarchy*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 9.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which includes the customize page parameter value as the default page parameter, to have further included an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hind et al, and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), *a portlet specified value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), as well as *override preferences* (column 6, lines 12-32: *whereas, override settings/preferences are determined*). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach, *the page parameter value is a default value, and an override hierarchy that specifies that the default page parameter is the selected value.*

Abrams et al and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

However, Abrams et al and Hind et al do not expressly teach *and an override hierarchy that specifies that the default page parameter is the selected value*

Art Unit: 2178

Burnard et al teaches *an override hierarchy*, that each objects parameters include attributes/values (as similarly explained in the abstract, and Fig 9)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which include the default page parameter value, to have further included an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hind et al, and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 32, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 9, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 33, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 10, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 34, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in claim 11, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 35, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 12, and is rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 15 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999), in further view of Katariya et al (US Patent: 6,564,251 B2, issued: May 13, 2003, filed: Dec. 3, 1998).

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Abrams et al teaches *the data associated with the routine, and communicated with the portal repository*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 14, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach the data associated with the routine, is communicated to the portal repository *as an XML document*.

Katariya et al teaches communicating with the portal repository, through the use of an *XML document* (columns 5 and 6, lines 59-67 and 1-9 respectively: whereas, preference/parameter information is communicated to a portal repository via XML format).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's communication of data to a portal repository, such that the data is passed using a XML document. The combination of Abrams et al and Katariya et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have allowed "the content of each page to have been enhanced by the rendered data from the provider objects,

Art Unit: 2178

thereby adding dynamic behavior to the predefined page" (Katariya et al, column 2, lines 26-31).

With regards to claim 38, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 15, and is rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Haut et al (US Application: 2003/0110448 A1): This reference teaches variables/placeholder data values that are shared amongst portlets.
- Jones et al (US Patent: 7,103,844 B2): This reference teaches portal/portlet synchronization through aggregation.
- Jerrard-Dunne et al (US Application: 2004/0090969 A1): Portlet data sharing, with GUI mapper.
- Jolley et al (US Application: 2003/0149722 A1): This reference teaches data flow/communications between portlets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W.T. 12/21/06

Wilson Tsui  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2178  
December 21, 2006



STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER